



# EXHIBIT #9

## RECEIVED

Rachel Benson &lt;bensonr@graffon-ma.gov&gt;

**Re: Wireless Radiation and Public Health**

SEP 21 2017

# COPY

Cecelia Doucette <c2douce@gmail.com>  
 To: Joe Laydon <laydonj@graffon-ma.gov>  
 Cc: bensonr@graffon-ma.gov

**PLANNING BOARD  
 GRAFTON, MA**

Wed, Sep 20, 2017 at 3:14 PM

Thanks so much, Joe, for your timely response. Rachel, thanks too for speaking with me this afternoon.

I hope, as the Grafton town planning team, you will continue to stay closely attuned to this issue as the industry is already working on their next wave of wireless infrastructure: to put antennas at street level every four to 12 houses to carry vast amounts of data for 5G and the Internet of Things. Towns that have not come up to speed will unwittingly allow this biological toxin into their neighborhoods and then be unable to remove it.

Within weeks of the U.S. National Toxicology Program announcing wireless radiation causes brain and heart tumors, the FCC pushed to get 5G spectrum approved before the public could catch on. You can learn more about that [here](#).

While the industry and the FCC would have us believe the jury's still out on whether wireless radiation is harmful, our world's scientists have already concluded it is very hazardous, but the industry is still allowed to bring toxic products to market. You can see more about the science [here](#), and more on what the industry is up to [here](#). You will see that T-Mobile, for example, commissioned a study on health effects back in 2000 and then proceeded to bury the report when it showed harm. Harvard has since published the Captured Agency report indicating how the FCC is run by the industries it presumably regulates and that they are putting corporate profit above public health. That's available at the link above too.

Indeed, Section 704 of the Telecom Act precludes refusing a cell tower based on environmental harm. In the courts, unfortunately, they have set precedent to include human health harm in that as well.

However, I believe the citing of a cell tower cannot be mandated on a private property such as the church so your town government should have the authority to stop it on one or more of the following:

- Can I ask what your **wireless communication facility setback** is in your town by-laws? If the proposed cell tower does not meet that setback, then you should be able to refuse the cell tower.
- Other towns have refused a cell tower because it brings large, loud buzzing equipment with it on the ground and that interferes with **aesthetics**.
- Others have refused them because they **disrupt a historic district**. Are you familiar with the MBTA's project with a telecom company to place wi-fi monopoles all along the commuter rail, that can then be used as cell towers too? They tried to start on the North Shore and because of great upheaval in Andover and Manchester-by-the-Sea, the project was killed. Our Massachusetts congressional delegation of legislators sent in a letter to the FCC based on Historical District concerns. The I-Team covered it [here](#). (Ashland wasn't notified of the project even though we have the commuter rail in our town; I learned about it and informed our municipal leaders, and our Town Planner attended the next hearing at the Transportation Building to protect Ashland residents.)
- Still others have refused cell antennas based on the fact that prospective home buyers do not want to live near a cell tower so **property values drop**, which in turn **drops tax revenue** for the town.
- Is the church aware that they will be taxed on the revenues they earn? Are they aware that by accepting revenue from the telecom company, that profit generation could **jeopardize their non-profit status**?
- If you can stand at the church and make a cell call, then there is **no gap in coverage** and the industry should not be able to force a cell tower in if there is cellular coverage. It doesn't have to be a good internet connection, just a basic cell call connection. See this [article](#) on how one Georgia community just stopped a cell tower based on the coverage gap issue this summer.
- If there are issues with the cell antennas, such as fires, etc., who assumes **liability**? The telecom company? The church? Or the Town for allowing the permit? Please look carefully at insurance policies as many insurers have identified wireless radiation as a leading risk and are putting exclusionary clauses in their policies for devices that emit radiofrequency radiation. Please see [Legal Issues](#) on my research repository to see how Lloyd's of London, AM Best, Swiss RE and others are walking away. You'd be well advised to get in writing who would assume liability.

You can use all of the above to protect the citizens in your charge, without having to bring up health concerns in a public meeting.

Ethically, I hope you will do everything in your influence to protect the abutters and others in Grafton. Did you know the biological recommendation for cell tower siting is 1/4 mile from people, and 1/2 mile for anyone with compromised health? Putting in a cell tower next to a pediatric office where sick children are brought would be unconscionable. Putting in a cell tower next to a home where pediatric interns sleep and are expected to get up each day to treat sick children would be unethical too. The science shows wireless radiation is linked to sleep disruption, cognitive impairment, memory issues, behavioral issues, chronic fatigue and more. Our scientists have found the mechanisms of harm, there is no longer any doubt.

I have brought Ashland's Town Planner, Sheila Page, up to speed on this issue. She put me in touch with our Building Commissioner, who put me in touch with the gentleman who runs the SEMBOA conference. He offered me a table at the conference this spring, and we had incredible conversations for two days. Many MA building commissioners and inspectors were already quite aware wireless technology is harming our towns. Many are standing up against industry too, and winning. Quite often, when challenged, the industry just moves on to another town or comes up with a location in the same town that is not near citizens.

I hope Grafton will give it its best shot to protect its citizens. We don't have to just roll over because the industry tells us to. You're welcome to see the page in my research repository [For Municipal Leaders](#) for additional information.

Joe and Rachel, I know this is a lot of new information to digest, and I would be honored to come in and educate you and your colleagues on this because it affects all of us on both a personal and professional level. There are many solutions once we are educated.

Warm regards,

Cece Doucette  
Technology Safety Educator  
Ashland, MA  
508-881-3878  
[Understanding EMFs](#)  
[Wireless Education](#)

On Tue, Sep 19, 2017 at 6:14 PM, Joe Laydon <[laydonj@grafton-ma.gov](mailto:laydonj@grafton-ma.gov)> wrote:  
Cecelia,

Thank you for the information.

I appreciate the information that you have collected and are willing to share. However I don't believe that I am the best audience to share this information with.

I understand that the information in this email is intended to be shared with the Planning Board at the upcoming public hearing for a wireless facility at 30 Grafton Common. I will be submitting this email to Board for inclusion on the record for the public hearing.

Local approval of wireless facilities is constrained by FCC regulations. I anticipate our wireless consultant will address this with the audience and the Board. The fact is that the Board can not take into consideration health impacts during the public hearing and that our consultant will be reviewing submitted information to verify compliance with FCC guidelines.

I appreciate the issues you raise and the unknown impacts wireless transmissions may have on all of us. I know that we may not know for some time the impact on exposure, however as related to the application for 30 Grafton Common, health impacts can not be considered as long as they comply with established standards.

Thank you again for your email.

Sincerely

Joe

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 19, 2017, at 5:37 PM, Cecelia Doucette <[c2douce@gmail.com](mailto:c2douce@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Benson, Mr. Laydon and Mr. Scully,

Ms. Benson, I hope you will kindly forward this to Mr. Scully.

Please allow me to introduce myself, my name is Cece Doucette from Ashland. Four years ago an electrical engineer friend mentioned to me that wireless technology was brought to market with no safety testing and that it could be biologically hazardous.

As former president of our local education foundation I ran seven campaigns to bring wireless devices into our schools. Then I went to work for our schools directly as our grant coordinator, where I helped our educators receive grants for iPads, Chromebooks, Minis, smartboards, Apple TVs and more -- what we all thought was great new technology.

Learning there could be harm, I began to investigate. It turns out there are literally thousands of studies all over the world showing biological harm from not only cell phones and cell towers, but all of our wi-fi devices and routers too. Many feel the effects in the near-term in the way of stabbing headaches, nosebleeds, dizziness, ringing in the ears, skin rashes, brain fog, memory problems, insomnia, behavioral issues, anxiety, depression and/or cognitive impairment -- but they don't know to connect it to wireless exposures.

In the long-term, science is showing links to a multitude of cancers including brain, salivary, thyroid and heart tumors. There is also evidence linking wireless radiation to the rising incidence of Alzheimer's, autism, DNA damage, infertility, miscarriages and more.

The industry, however, has been very effective at deploying the tobacco industry handbook: if you suppress evidence of harm and create doubt, and the public will continue to buy your products and allow toxic infrastructure to be installed. Their advertising revenues prevent credible scientific studies from making it into mainstream media so few are aware wireless is hazardous.

Fortunately, Ashland has become a national leader in educating the public at the community level. When our School Committee read the fine print that comes with every device, they saw even the manufacturers themselves have a legal disclaimer to say keep the device away from your body or you may exceed the FCC and international limits for public radiation exposure. But nobody knows it's there. We have taken a first-in-the-nation step to protect the students and staff in our schools and posted Best Practices for Mobile Devices in all of our classrooms.

Ashland is also the first in the nation to host a six-part documentary film and discussion series on Electromagnetic Radiation and Health, and to put on loan an Acoustimeter so residents and business owners can measure and remediate their homes, offices, schools and leisure spaces.

Five of our Massachusetts legislators have independently introduced seven bills this session to address wireless radiation and public health. Dr. Robert Knorr, the Director of the Bureau of Environmental Health at the Massachusetts Department of Public Health is working on fact sheets to educate the public on wireless radiation and health.

I am writing to you today to request a meeting to share additional information with you so that you may be well informed in your decisions regarding wireless communication facilities, hopefully with an eye toward protecting the citizens of Grafton from further radiation exposure. There are also property value considerations to be had.

Might you be so gracious as to schedule a time in your busy schedule to meet with me in the coming week?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cece Doucette  
Technology Safety Educator  
Ashland, MA  
508-881-3878  
Understanding EMFs  
Wireless Education

